

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 remain in this application. In the Office Action mailed January 30, 2007, Claims 1-16 were rejected under Section 112 as being indefinite in view of the inclusion of the term "easily" in the independent claims nos. 1 and 9. Claims 1-8 otherwise were indicated as being allowable if amended to overcome the 112 rejection. Similarly, Claim 14 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the same 112 rejection and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 17-20 stand allowed. Claims 9-13, 15, 16 and 21-33 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious in view of several different combinations of cited prior art patents.

By the present Amendment, Claim 1 has been amended to eliminate the objectionable term "easily". In addition, Claims 1-8 were further amended as to form. Accordingly, Claims 1-8 should now be allowable. Claim 14 has been amended so as to be in independent form and includes all of the limitations of original Claim 9 from which it previously depended. Inasmuch as the objectionable language in original Claim 9 has been removed from Claim 14, Claim 14 is also in condition for allowance.

While the rejections of Claims 9-13, 15, 16 and 21-33 under Section 103 are respectfully traversed, each of the rejected claims has been amended to more particularly recite Applicant's invention and to distinguish that invention from the cited art. Specifically, Claim 9 was amended to recite that the plurality of sliding grooves provided on the sliding member are all formed on the same horizontal plane. The cited references do not teach or suggest such a configuration.

Claims 11-16 all depended directly from amended Claim 9 and thus contain the recitations of amended Claim 9. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that those claims now recite patentable subject matter over the art of record.


Regarding independent Claims 21, 23 and 31 and the remainder of the pending claims which are all dependent thereon, the cited references do not teach or suggest the second sensor configured to detect if the coin receiving tube is positioned on a first location and a second location in combination with a microcomputer configured to control the coin sorting apparatus in accordance with a signal from the second sensor as now set forth in the claims. In the present invention, when the coin receiving tube is positioned on a first location and a second location, the coin sorting apparatus is operated. In contrast, Ishida merely discloses that when the cassette tube is mounted on the money processor, *i.e.* a first location, the money processor is operated.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that with the present amendments to the claims, all of the claims now in the application define patentable subject matter over the art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that these claims be allowed and the application passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

Dated: April 30, 2007
633 West Fifth Street, 21st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071-2040
Telephone: (213) 896-2400
Facsimile: (213) 896-2450
E-mail: PTdocketing@hklaw.com
Customer No. 34261

By 
Richard E. Lyon, Jr.
Registration No. 26,300
Attorneys for Applicant